#### Living wage decreases jobs

**Baird:**

Baird, Charles, a professor of economics and the director of the Smith Center for Private Enterprise Studies at California State University at Hayward, “The Living Wage Folly,” Ideas on Liberty, June 2002, pp. 16-19. [PDI]

It is well documented how **increases in legal minimum wages affect the employment prospects of workers who are least experienced, least well trained**, and who have not developed good work habits and attitudes**. Each 10 percent increase of a legal minimum wage results in job losses of 1.3 to 2 percent**. Moreover, as noted, **LWOs impose wages that are significantly higher than ordinary legal minimums. Economic theory tells us the negative responsiveness of jobs to increases in wages** (elasticity) **is greater at higher wages than at lower wages.** So **LWOs are even more destructive to jobs than increases of ordinary legal minimum wages.** Profit- seeking employers are willing to continue the employment of a worker only if the cost to the employer of the worker's services is not greater than the amount of money the employer would lose from sales (net of the cost savings on materials and supplies no longer used) if he lays off the worker. So **when increases of legal minimum wages are imposed in any form, including living wages**, some **workers will just be let go**. The ones that are always let go first are those who are the least productive. (The lost output and sales that follow on letting a worker go will not amount to much with a worker who isn't very productive.)

#### Living wage lays off teenagers and increases crime

**Barnes:**

Barnes 09, (Bill Barnes studied economics at the University of Georgia, “The Illusion of Living Wage Laws,” October 15, 2009, http://mises.org/library/illusion-living-wage-laws) [PDI]

Clearly, some **people are going to be adversely affected by a living wage**. One could argue from a standpoint of liberty (formerly an American ideal), that laws adversely affecting some groups should not be enacted, but we will only look at the economic impacts of such legislation here.¶ The data show that the **people most likely to be affected by living-wage legislation are black, teenage males.** **This group had a national unemployment rate of 33.8 percent in 2007**. When the data are broken down **for black males aged 16 and 17, the unemployment rate is in excess of 40 percent**.¶ These numbers are staggering, and they would only get worse with a living wage. Some **teenagers would not** even **have the option of work because the value of their marginal revenue would not equal their new, higher wage cost**.¶ So, what happens to these people who are left jobless? Well, they still need money and something to do during the day.¶ Not surprisingly, **crime rates are highest among those in their late teens and early twenties**. The Georgia Bureau of Investigation cites **young people, aged 17–21, as perpetrating 23.4 percent of** the **crimes** in the state.[3]¶ It is no coincidence that those who cannot find work tend to find things that get them into trouble to fill their time. I argue that **enactment of a living wage would** only **put more young people on the streets rather than in jobs where they can learn skills that will serve them well in the future**.¶ Not only is this **lack of work** bad **for young people and other low-skilled workers**, but it also **hurts the local economy**. Due to the higher mandated wage, jobs that are not worth this wage will no longer be performed legally in the community. Trash pickup, general cleaning, inexpensive food preparation, farming, and many other tasks would be either neglected or moved to places with lower wage costs.¶ This general lack of production would not be due to people's lack of desire to do the work, but to government's intervention, which would keep the tasks from being done on the grounds that their monetary value doesn't fit with the social agenda. It may seem desirable to keep people from working for too little money, but keeping people who want those jobs out of work is both an attack on liberty and a mistake in economics.

#### Insufficient hours are the problem not wages

**Horowitz:**

(Carl F. Horowitz, is a Washington, D.C.,–area consultant on labor, welfare reform, immigration, housing, and other domestic policy issues. He was previously a housing and urban affairs policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation and a Washington correspondent for Investor’s Business Daily, “Keeping the Poor Poor: The Dark Side of the Living Wage,” Policy Analysis No. 493, October 21, 2003, http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa493.pdf) [PDI) 

Advocates of the living wage argue that it combats poverty, but the evidence does not support that claim. First, **the problem for low-income Americans is really insufficient hours rather than insufficient wages.** **A** Bureau of Labor Statistics **report revealed that in 2000 only 3.5 percent of all household heads who worked full-time 27 weeks or more over the course of the year fell below the poverty line.** By contrast, **this figure was 10.2 percent for household heads who worked less than 27 weeks**.23 The BLS study also revealed that **only a few more than 20 percent of all house- hold heads with below-poverty-line incomes attributed their condition solely to low earnings**. **The remaining 80 percent cited unemployment, involuntary part-time employment, or one or both of those factors** in combination with low earnings. In addition, the Census Bureau reported that **the median income in 1999 for household heads working full-time year-round** (50 weeks or more) was $55,619. By contrast, household heads working full-time 27 to 49 weeks had a median income of only $38,868, and **for those who worked full-time 26 weeks or less the figure was $26,001.24** An Employment Policies Institute analysis of 1995 **Census** Current Population Survey **data concluded that only 44 percent of minimum wage employees worked full time**.25

# AFC+Polls Bad

#### A is the interpretation.

Debaters may not read AFC combined with descriptive standards used to justify polls.

#### B is the violation.

The aff read X.

#### C is the standards.

1. Topic literature- some of the best topic lit includes analysis of the effects of the implementation of the living wage and its positive and negative benefits. The Dube, Neumark and Adams, Baird, Barnes, and others talk about why the living wage is good or bad based on the effects of its implementation – that means I cannot engage the 1AC- since it bypasses the majority of the topic literature, because the aff only argues descriptive reasons affirming is good. ALSO, even if you prove there is some literature for on your side, that does not mean that it is qualitatively better than what I talk about. Also, I’m the only one who qualifies topic literature so you err neg on this issue. This also means that my interp is key to ground because all DA’s and CP’s are rooted in topic literature- your interp denies my access to those arguments. - Key to fairness because if your args aren’t rooted in the topic literature I can’t reasonably predict or engage in them.
2. Disad/Turn Ground- forcing me to debate under the aff’s framework means the impacts to disads won’t matter, and I can’t turn statistics- my only option after the aff strat is to either read theory or polls that conclude neg. Additionally this puts the burden on me to be prepared to respond to any combination of AFC and descriptive frameworks which significantly skews the research burden. There are lots of reasons people might conclude they would like to have a living wage, and I could spend hours researching them and never touch on the reasons read in the 1AC.

#### D is voters.

Fairness is a voter first because debate is a competitive activity- Unfairness skews the ability to render a decision and means that evaluation of the round will be skewed.

Additionally, everyone has a different view on educational merit but everyone can see blatant abuse. Fairness is the key to education because there wouldn’t be debate if it weren’t a competitive activity.

Evaluate theory through competing interps- A) Reasonability is arbitrary; I can’t know how you evaluate what is justified. B) Competing interps serves to resolve theory debates through a less convoluted manner- it gives a method and format to the argument. C) Reasonability devolves to competing interps anyway- to prove reasonability you must justify why your practice for debate is good.

Drop the debater-

1. The abuse has already been committed; if they can just drop the argument there is not a significant reason not to continue being abusive- there won’t be any change in behavior. Drop the debater to promote good in-round norms.
2. I committed a significant amount of time to proving why their practice is bad, if they can change the advocacy in the 1AR to sound legitimate then it renders the 1NC useless.
3. The substance debate is already tainted by the abusive view of the 1AC.

No RVIs:

1. You wouldn’t vote for a debater for following debate expectations- if they win an I-meet then they haven’t had to spend that much time on theory so don’t grant an RVI on time skew.
2. If they win a counter interp, it just means their practice isn’t hurting debate, so it’s not a voting issue- if they want offense from a counter interp they should specify and label it as an OCI and articulate why.

# Must Defend Implementation

#### A is the interpretation.

If the affirmative defends the resolution as a general principal they must defend the implementation of a living wage policy by government agents.

#### B is the violation.

The aff doesn’t defend implementation.

#### C is the standards.

1. Topic literature- some of the best topic lit includes analysis of the effects of the implementation of the living wage and its positive and negative benefits. The Dube, Neumark and Adams, Baird, Barnes, and others talk about why the living wage is good or bad based on the effects of its implementation – that means I cannot engage the 1AC- since it bypasses the majority of the topic literature. ALSO, even if you prove there is some literature for on your side that does not mean that it is qualitatively better than what I talk about. Also, I’m the only one who qualifies topic literature so you err neg on this issue. This also means that my interp is key to ground because all DA’s and CP’s are rooted in topic literature- your interp denies my access to those arguments. - Key to fairness because if your args aren’t rooted in the topic literature I can’t reasonably predict or engage in them.

#### D is voters.

Fairness is voter because debate is a competitive activity- unfairness skews your evaluation of the round and means any decision you render post theory is arbitrary. [Additionally, everyone has a different view on educational merit but everyone can see blatant abuse. Fairness is the key to education because there wouldn’t be debate if it weren’t a competitive activity.]

Use a competing interps paradigm on theory: A) reasonability is arbitrary- I don’t know what you think is arbitrary so competing interps is the only way to render a decision B) Theory debates are convoluted enough- having clear and concise rules helps you adjudicate and c) reasonability collapses to competing interps- you have to justify a threshold for abuse, which necessitates an interp of what practice you defend.

Drop the debater-

1. The abuse has already been committed; if they can just drop the argument there is not a significant reason not to continue being abusive- there won’t be any change in behavior. Drop the debater to promote good in-round norms.
2. I spent a lot of time indicating why their practice was abusive- voting them down is the only way to compensate for my time loss. Also, it’s the only way to render an accurate decision because your view on substance is already skewed as per the voter.
3. On this issue specifically, dropping the argument doesn’t make sense. I say you must defend implementation. If you don’t , then dropping the argument means dropping the entirety of the 1AC including the advocacy which is equivalent to dropping the debater. Letting them read a new advocacy in the 1AR recommits abuse, because it’s an advocacy shift, which nullifies my 1NC. It also gives them a positive time tradeoff, because they have 7 minutes to talk about their new advocacy while I only have 6.

No RVIs:

1. You wouldn’t vote for a debater for following debate expectations- if they win an I-meet then they haven’t had to spend that much time on theory so don’t grant an RVI on time skew.
2. If they win a counter interp, it just means their practice isn’t hurting debate, so it’s not a voting issue- if they want offense from a counter interp they should specify and label it as an OCI and articulate why.

# Don’t Need Policy Alt

#### Counter Interp:

Debaters must be able to read discourse or rhetoric kritiks with non policy-implementable alternatives.

#### Standards:

1. Real world decision making- Congress doesn’t pass a law just because there isn’t a better one. Additionally, lawmakers have veto power- if a proposal has problems they reject it, there is no rule that they have to propose a replacement policy.
2. Discourse evaluation- the point of a rhetoric or discourse K is that they create awareness about the way we speak in and out of round. Just because an alt is implemented through critical discourse doesn’t make it less valuable, rather it is more valuable because at the end of the day the judge is an educator not a lawmaker.

#### Voters:

1. Education- debate is first and foremost an educational activity- if there was no academic benefit to debating, schools and parents wouldn’t endorse it. At the end of the day what matters isn’t the trophies we win, it’s the critical thinking and communication skills we take away from the activity. Discourse is uniquely important to education because it frames the way we evaluate the world.

Grant me an RVI:

1. RVIs discourage frivolous theory shells like ‘policy alts’- if I can win by turning theory there is no unique reason making it easier or more strategic for the aff to go for theory instead of engaging with the K, which is better for education.
2. RVIs specifically help negative debaters combat the aff advantage of having the extra 2AR to weigh theory issues- aff read theory in the 1AR, so they get to spend two speeches on it while I get one.

# Counter Interp to Must Defend Squo

If the affirmative debater reads neg must defend the status quo on the 2015 Jan/Feb LD topic they must specify what the status quo would look like in the 1AC. To clarify, the aff must tell the negative exactly what the status quo is in the 1AC.

Reasons to prefer:

1. 1AC strategy is unclear as to what world would not violate, makes it infinitely more difficult to negate because I don’t know what I’m allowed to defend- the economy and perception of what constitutes a living wage varies greatly by city and country. This makes it impossible for me to gain offense because there I can’t know what will violate the 1AC spike.
2. Topic literature- because economies differ so greatly from area to area, some of the best topic lit will inevitably be excluded. I can’t cite the better meta analyses like Dube, Neumark and Adams, Baird, or Barnes, because they may justify a status quo that doesn’t meet the interp. Even if the 1AC provides topic literature that meets their definition of the squo, that doesn’t mean it’s qualitatively better than the ones I talk about, and since I’m the only one talking about topic literature err neg on this issue.
3. Potential abuse outweighs in round abuse because even if the 1AC clarifies in the next speech that the interp only means I defend a world without living wage, my strategy has already been shaped by the potential violations that weren’t clarified originally. So even if I could have read the position I would have without the spike, I would have been doing so without knowing if I violate. Even if the 1AC doesn’t intentionally leave the spike unclear, the potential to make any position I read incompatible outweighs because it allows an unfair advocacy shift in the 1AR that renders the 1NC useless.

Fairness is voter because debate is a competitive activity- unfairness skews your evaluation of the round and means any decision you render post theory is arbitrary. [Additionally, everyone has a different view on educational merit but everyone can see blatant abuse. Fairness is the key to education because there wouldn’t be debate if it weren’t a competitive activity.]

Use a competing interps paradigm on theory: A) reasonability is arbitrary- I don’t know what you think is arbitrary so competing interps is the only way to render a decision B) Theory debates are convoluted enough- having clear and concise rules helps you adjudicate and c) reasonability collapses to competing interps- you have to justify a threshold for abuse, which necessitates an interp of what practice you defend.

No CX checks- no theory interp can be changed in CX, all components of a rule must be specifically included in the interp; the responsibility is on the 1AC. We don’t allow a debater to say, “oh I forgot to say X” and add a plank, so the 1AC can’t justify fixing the interp in CX when I ask to tell me what squo to defend.

Drop the debater-

1. The abuse has already been committed; if they can just drop the argument there is not a significant reason not to continue being abusive- there won’t be any change in behavior. Drop the debater to promote good in-round norms.
2. I committed a significant amount of time to proving why their practice is bad, if they can change the advocacy in the 1AR to sound legitimate then it renders the 1NC useless.
3. The substance debate is already tainted by the abusive view of the 1AC. This means you can’t evaluate substance objectively and have to vote on theory.

No RVIs-

1. You wouldn’t vote for a debater for following debate expectations- if they win an I-meet then they haven’t had to spend that much time on theory so don’t grant an RVI on time skew.
2. If they win a counter interp, it just means their practice isn’t hurting debate, so it’s not a voting issue- if they want offense from a counter interp they should specify and label it as an OCI and articulate why.

# Squo Plans Bad

1. Interpretation: If the affirmative debater defends a specific advocacy, that advocacy must not be currently implemented in its current state, in the status quo. To clarify, under my interpretation, plans are fine- the aff just is not allowed to read plans that are implemented in the status quo.
2. Violation: You conceded in cross ex that your plan happens in the status quo.
3. Reasons to prefer:
   1. Your interp means the neg never gets any turn ground. If the plan is already occurring, it means that the effects of implementation are already occurring. This means, if your evidence is right, implementation is obviously beneficial. No turn ground, because generics don’t apply because you’ll claim they aren’t specific to your advocacy. Also, doesn’t matter if I have generic turns if they’re qualitatively worse than your arguments. Links to fairness because we both need qualitatively and quantitatively good ground under your interp to get the ballot.
   2. Your interp destroys all DA ground specifically- most DA’s especially politics require the 1AC to take a specific action that is not happening in the 1AC. That’s the only way for me to get links to trigger DA’s and specific turns- means your interp gets rids of a litany of negative outs to the 1AC.
4. Voter: Vote on fairness because the judge is supposed to adjudicate who the better debater is, which is impossible to do if the round is skewed towards someone. Drop the debater because A) I indict your strategy not your specific arguments. Means dropping the argument doesn’t solve because it is your strategy that prevents me from accessing arguments. B) Drop the arg means you no longer have an advocacy to generate offense to which means it’s functionally drop the debater anyways. No new advocacies in the 1AR because that’s infinitely unpredictable and you get a time benefit.

Use competing interps- that means you need an explicit counter interp and offense back to it to win on the theory debate. A) Reasonability is arbitrary- I don’t know what your BS meter is. B) Reasonability justifies a standard that shows what is and isn’t abusive- but that requires you win why that is good which is just competing interps. C) Competing interps promotes a race to the top, which is good because it creates the best norms.

NO RVI’s

1. Fallacy of denying the antecedent- you shouldn’t win for being fair. That is your burden to proactively be fair
2. Chilling effect- If debaters go for RVI’s, other debaters will be too afraid to check for abuse because good theory debaters will beat them on the issue. This means abuse never stops.